Postal Regulatory Commission Submitted 5/25/2012 3:41:17 PM Filing ID: 82781 Accepted 5/25/2012

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

Mail Processing Network
Rationalization Service Changes, 2012

Docket No. N2012-1

PRESIDING OFFICER'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 8

(Issued May 25, 2012)

In this docket, the Commission has retained the services of two consultants to provide an independent evaluation of cost and staffing changes resulting from the Postal Service's network consolidation plan.¹ Commission sponsored witness Weed is requested to respond to the following questions to clarify his testimony. In order to facilitate inclusion of the requested material in the evidentiary record, he shall be available to attest to the accuracy of the answers and be prepared to explain, to the extent necessary, the basis for the answers at the June 12-15, 2012 hearings. Responses shall be provided no later than June 7, 2012.

- In the Appendix, Exhibit 12, of his testimony, witness Weed (PRCWIT-T-1)
 shows that Manual Letters, Manual Flats, and Parcel/Priority Processing
 experienced double-digit gains in productivity from the Pre-AMP to the Final PIR.
 - a. Please describe the likely cause(s) of the large productivity increases.
 - Would you expect that similar productivity increases would take place if the consolidations proposed in Docket No. N2012-1 are implemented?
 Please explain why or why not.

¹ See Presiding Officer's Notice of Sponsorship of Testimony on Cost and Staffing Issues, March 21, 2012.

- 2. In the Appendix, Exhibit 12, of his testimony, witness Weed (PRCWIT-T-1) shows that total non-measured operations hours decreased by 27.7 percent from the Pre-AMP to the Final PIR.
 - a. Please describe the likely cause(s) of the large cost reductions.
 - Would you expect that similar cost reductions would take place if the consolidations proposed in Docket No. N2012-1 are implemented?
 Please explain why or why not.
- On pages 33-44 of his testimony, witness Weed (PRCWIT-T-1) presents an alternative processing window intended to retain a subset of current overnight committed mail.
 - a. How would this alternative proposal affect the total workhour requirements and associated productivity of the processing network?
 - b. To what extent would implementation of such a proposal decrease the total costs of the Postal Service?

Ruth Y. Goldway Presiding Officer